

Gc
929.2
C3685ch
2011612

M. L.

REYNOLDS HISTORICAL
GENEALOGY COLLECTION

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1833 01202 5356



A faint, light gray watermark image of a classical building with four columns and a triangular pediment is visible in the background.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018

<https://archive.org/details/chapmansofoldsay00chap>

THE CHAPMANS

of

OLD SAYBROOK, CONNECTICUT

A FAMILY CHRONICLE

By

EDWARD M. CHAPMAN

PRIVately PRINTED

1941

8 047

78 9421 9

THE CHAPMANS

of

OLD SAYBROOK, CONNECTICUT

A FAMILY CHRONICLE

By

EDWARD M. CHAPMAN

PRIVately PRINTED

1941

11 047

78 9421 9

2011612



Ric's aug 23 -1978

卷之三



TO THE
HONOURED MEMORY

OF

ROBERT CHAPMAN

161? - 1687

NATHANAEL CHAPMAN

1653 - 1726

CALEB CHAPMAN

1706 - 1785

ELISHA CHAPMAN

1740 - 1825

GEORGE HENRY CHAPMAN

1789 - 1877

ROBERT CHAPMAN

1831 - 1923

SIX PLAIN MEN

WHO FOUNDED AND MAINTAINED IN THIS
COMMUNITY A HOME THAT HAS OUTLIVED
THREE CENTURIES HANDING ON FROM FATHER
TO SON AN UNBROKEN TRADITION OF
SERVICE IN CHURCH AND CIVIL STATE

THIS TABLET IS DEDICATED

IN FILIAL GRATITUDE

BY

THEIR CHILDREN'S CHILDREN

THE FATHER TO THE CHILDREN SHALL MAKE KNOWN

Copyright
1941

EDWARD M. CHAPMAN

Printed in the United States of America
THE BINGHAM PRESS
New London, Connecticut

PREFATORY NOTE

"I cannot help prefacing this little treatise with assuring those into whose hands it shall fall that as my motive for writing it is the charity of a parent, not the vanity of an author, so I design it merely for the benefit of my own family, without any view to the press."

So wrote Lord Hervey of the famous Memoirs two hundred and ten years ago beginning a gruesome little essay on his own bad health. Change 'parent' to 'son' and his words exactly fit this more wholesome topic of mine.

A small family group augmented by two or three personal friends gathered in the old 'Burying Ground' at Saybrook Point on the 13th of July, 1939, to dedicate the Memorial a photograph of which forms the frontispiece of this pamphlet. In the foreground are the grave-stones of Nathanael Chapman, born in Oliver Cromwell's time, and of his wife. The private service consisted of an Invocation by the Rev. Dr. Woodin, Minister of the ancient Saybrook Church, the Unveiling of the Tablet by Mr. Howard Tully Chapman, 'the youngest member of the Family in his generation, a brief Address by the author, and the Benediction by the Rev. Dr. Melville K. Bailey.

The pages which follow contain the substance of this ten minute talk very much enlarged and provided with a few genealogical tables; and I have thought it best to

retain the informality of direct address. The Stone itself, of the best Barre granite fittingly left in its rough-hewn state, was erected by Bottinelli of New London. The Tablet was designed and cast by the Bronze Division of the Gorham Company. The Inscription is by a member of the Family.

It is hoped that should time and change remove the family name from our three hundred year home in Old Saybrook the Memorial will still testify that while we remained we were disposed to remember rather than forget.

E. M. C.

WESTWAYS,
New London, Conn.
25 August, 1941.

THE CHAPMANS OF OLD SAYBROOK

THE FAMILY CHRONICLE

More than a score of years ago I spoke to our Father of a desire to erect a memorial of some sort to our Saybrook ancestors. He was much interested and wished to have a hand in the enterprise. Little came of this at the time and I am divided in my mind as to whether it would have been better done then than now. To have had his help would have been a delight; but on the other hand it would not have been practicable then to mark the term of his life on the tablet — perhaps not to include his name at all. Nor could we have spoken of "a home that has outlived three centuries"; for the third century of residence was not then quite complete. So it is better, perhaps, that the project should have awaited this year of grace and we do well to be thankful that so many of his children are together to dedicate this stone with its inscription.

I do not propose to enlarge upon family history beyond saying a word or two about each of the persons whose lives are here recorded in order to help you to see a man instead of merely reading a name.

Robert the Settler came to this country as a youth of eighteen or thereabout almost certainly in 1635. The statement in the Chapman Genealogy that he came to Saybrook with Lyon Gardiner in November of that year

is clearly a mistake. The Genealogy says that he and Gardiner sailed from Boston on November 3. But it is a matter of record that Gardiner did not reach Boston from England until November 28, 1635. He was then sent to examine and report upon the defenses of Salem, whence he brought back word that the chief enemy to be apprehended by the Salem people was 'Captain Hunger.' My own opinion therefore is that Gardiner came to Saybrook in the Spring of 1636, though it may have been so early as to have been counted 1635 in the Old Style which would carry that year into the month of March; and that Robert Chapman came with him; though it is possible that he was one of the twenty men sent with Lieut. Gibbons in November, 1635, and that Gardiner found him here. I doubt whether this matter can ever be definitely settled.

The question is always asked by some fearful descendant as to whether his ancestors fell into the class of assisted emigrants who are sometimes called 'bondmen'. It is not an entirely pertinent question because almost every one of old New England or Virginia descent is pretty sure to have an assisted emigrant somewhere in his family line. There were 'bondmen' and 'bondwomen' who were induced to emigrate under promise of payment of passage and whose services were sold — one might almost say that their persons were sold — for a term of years upon their arrival in the new country. I suspect,

though I do not know, that this custom was somewhat more prevalent in the Southern Colonies than in New England. I feel fairly confident that it was relatively infrequent in the small Saybrook Colony, though indentured servants were sometimes sent over. Two, indeed, were sent over to Robert Chapman himself, as we shall presently see.

I do not think that Robert Chapman fell into such a category any more than did his brother-in-law, Lieut. William Bushnell, who with two brothers came to Massachusetts, left it after a brief residence for Long Island, and so reached Guilford very early in its settlement, probably attracted thither by acquaintance or relationship with some of its settlers. Thence Robert Chapman asked him to move to Saybrook and he did so soon becoming one of the settlement's substantial citizens. He had married Robert Chapman's sister Rebecca and their first child, a son, was born in Saybrook in 1644.

There is no trace here of any responsibility as of an indentured servant to a master for a term of years. These men moved about as they saw fit and as their useful calling as builders of houses and mills induced them to do until they found fit place for permanent residence. I think Robert Chapman was in that general class. But I also think it quite possible that, very young man as he was, he agreed to come into the colony and stay for a time that the common interests of the Founders might be

served. One authority says that he seems to have been a soldier. This I incline to doubt if by 'soldier' is meant one who had served in an army. He could scarcely have done that at his rather tender age. But a practical soldier he became and continued to be and I regard his coming to Saybrook and very likely his coming to this country as under a sort of enlistment. There is no trace of an indenture that I can discover.

He was a youth of respectable education writing as good a hand as Governor Winthrop and a better one than Lyon Gardiner; and spelling no more weirdly than the average letter-writer of the time. His mother seems to have been a woman of spirit and there is a tradition that she was desirous of coming across the sea herself but could not persuade her husband to it. One daughter came we know; probably two others, one of whom married and went with her husband to the West Indies. It is a matter of record that his mother sent Robert two indentured servants, probably from London in care of some emigrant. So I take the family to have been people of intelligence, energy and probably some means though these may well have been small.

We find this young man here then with Gardiner at the beginning of the Pequot War. They seem to have been like-minded men and it was owing to their association, and the later urge of Robert Chapman and Thomas Hurlburt, that Gardiner in 1660 wrote his celebrated letter

to these old companions-in-arms — a letter that is now one of the most cherished (and sometimes very puzzling) documents dealing with that critical time. Robert played his part in the struggle. He was once nearly surprised by the Indians when "beating samp by the garden pales"; a circumstance which defines that much disputed word 'samp' for us. It was simply Indian corn cracked by beating probably by mortar and pestle. He acted as sentinel on one end of the line on the memorable day when Gardiner went out to burn the reeds in the marsh and the Pequots fell upon the little company near where the mill-stones now lie between the two coves. They killed two men, thought they had killed Gardiner and did wound him, and drove the hard-pressed English back to their fort whither two men had already run away.

More peaceful times followed after the Pequots had been subdued; and our First Settler then became active in the development of the Colony and the general service of Connecticut. He served as Deputy to the General Court forty-three times and nine times served on the Governor's Council of Assistants. He was almost certainly present at the organization of the Church in 1646 — the chaplains of the Fort had served the community up to that date — and in point of years of membership must at the time of his death in 1687 have been one of its oldest members. His lot upon the Point adjoined and was partly enclosed by the lot of George Fenwick; and when the

Lynde gift to the Collegiate School that was to become Yale College was made the plot was bounded on the west by the land of these two men as represented by their legatees.

On the 4th of January, 1648, an agreement was made by which the colonists divided considerable portions of the town lands and Robert Chapman cast in his lot with the Oyster River Quarter. The 'ratings' in this division, though probably little more than nominal, ran from 50 to 300 pounds. One man only is set down at 300 pounds. Three, Robert Chapman, Stephen Post and George Fenwick, have portions rated at 250 pounds each; so that only a dozen years after his arrival as a youth of about eighteen he appears as a relatively substantial citizen.

His holdings in the Oyster River Quarter by grant and later purchase seem to have included most of the land between Beacon Hill on the north and the Sound on the south, with Oyster River for the eastern and Hagar's Creek for the western boundaries, though the western line is very hard to trace and I emphasise the fact that he held most and not all of the land within these bounds. This estate included the major part of the arable land owned by our Grandfather and Father. The soil was generally light but responsive to culture and excellent culture it received during our Father's life. Our Great Grandfather, Captain Elisha, had, I suspect, spent too much time in the wars to be a very good husband to his

acres. There are traditions to back the suspicion. Our Grandfather did much to improve the farm; and there is a letter by his cousin, Judge Asa Chapman, which speaks in the highest terms of these improvements as he saw them on a visit to his old home in 1823. But during many of his active years the Boston business required so much of his time and personal presence that the farm had to be entrusted to a tenant — a procedure that very rarely succeeds in maintaining good conditions. So that when our Father took the management over on becoming of age there was abundant need of care. This he unremittingly gave it and brought it to a condition where it supplied us all with most of our sustenance and not a little of our culture. A nucleus of this original property which had never been bought or sold outside the Family remained with us until the wave of suburbanisation which is swamping all our coast towns engulfed it; though enough remains to provide a comfortable site for the Homestead which our Grandparents built. In it our Father and all his children were born; and in it our Grandparents, our Parents and a Brother and Sister have died.

As has been indicated Robert Chapman's first home was at the Point in one of the plots allotted to the First Settlers within the fortified area when it was still needful to live near one another for safety's sake; and it was not until nearly twenty years after the allotment of his Oyster River lands that he came to occupy them. His first house

was built near the home of our neighbours, the Denisons, and probably in 1666. There is a tradition that on one of the window-panes there was scratched the couplet,

In 1636 I here appeared;
In 1666 I this upreared.

This would imply that all his seven children were born in the home at the Point.

The English settlers were land-hungry — perhaps land-greedy would be a truer term, — and our good ancestor was no exception to the rule. I have already pointed out the fact that he soon set about rounding out his grant in Oyster River by purchases which gave him most of the country from Beacon Hill to the Sea. Twenty acres of this were purchased "of the yndian Squaws mary and Sarah," and eight acres of "william Jackson" whose name survives today on our Jackson Hill. These, however, were but items in the sum of his holdings though the solid Oyster River nucleus was very likely more important than the distant and rather hazy aura of lands at Long Point, Cook's Hill, at the mouth of the "Poochaug River", "in the thousand acres", "in the planting field", "at Pataquonk" (where he seems to have had fifty-six acres), to say nothing of his "meadow at Prikile pare Rock and up-land town commons and ox-pasture right 400 estate", whatever such vagueness may mean; or of the 4,500 acres in Hebron left to his sons John, Robert and Nathanael "as home lots".

His Hebron land appears to have come as a bequest from one of the sons of the famous Mohegan chieftain Uncas. This son seems to have been not merely friendly but sincerely attached to some of the Saybrook people, since he asked that after his death his two sons should be educated under the care of the settlers and that he himself should be buried in the English fashion. In consideration of such a trust he left this tract of land to Robert Chapman as one of the trustees. I have little doubt that if our Ancestor undertook the trust he strove to fulfil it since he was a responsible man, though sometimes too slow in doing public business to suit those in higher authority as will presently appear.

In general, however, I do not like the means used by the first settlers to obtain title to Indian lands any more than I condemn them in the wholesale fashion that has become so common. The Pequots were tyrannous interlopers who lorded it over the indigenous Connecticut Indians even as they made life intolerable to the early settlers; and they were bound finally to be overthrown. The overthrow of their tyranny calls for no especial sympathy except for the barbarous manner of their extermination. That is lamentable. But toward the mass of the relatively harmless natives one's sympathy naturally goes out. What title did they have to their lands except as wild hunting grounds? What justification had the petty chiefs for yielding title when an offer for purchase was

made? Had they refused to sell how long would these ten or twelve thousand natives have had a right so to pre-empt the 5,000 Connecticut square miles which now support over a million and a half people as to forbid settlement? And in the purchase of land to what extent was a real equivalent offered from the native standpoint and how often was advantage taken of their mixture of cunning and simplicity? These are confused and confusing questions much easier to ask than to answer. There can scarce be any doubt that if the suspicious phrase 'manifest destiny' mean anything it means that this land was to become the home of an industrious, inventive and practically adventurous people. It also means, alas, that in the process the native population was bound to dwindle and finally disappear however decent their treatment by the settlers might be; and we well know that it was far less than decent. This puzzle of 'manifest destiny' so-called is a part of what Scripture names 'the mystery of iniquity'.

Having possessed this young man of his acres let us turn now to his public employments and to his family. He was Lieutenant of the Oyster River Quarter. For many years he was the Town Clerk. In 1654, when Indian trouble threatened, he was one of two men appointed to act with Major Mason in arranging Saybrook's military expedition; though the threat of war did not finally fulfil itself at that time. In 1661 there appears to have been

a band of horses at pasture on the Lyme side of the River the ownership of which was undetermined. The Court directed that they be gathered in and that Robert Chapman, Reynold Marvin, Matthew Griswold and 'Jon Clark Sen'r' superintend their sale. The proceeds were to be divided equally between Marvin and Griswold on the one hand — they seem to have had some claim upon them — and the Colonial Treasury on the other. This was in May; and something apparently was done. But not enough; for in the following December Chapman and Clark were ordered to hasten an accounting from Marvin and Griswold and to determine the whole matter. Yet in 1662 it still hung fire since it appears that Marvin then owed the Court fifty pounds and that Robert Chapman had in his possession a mare and one or two of her colts. These the Court claimed and threatened to enforce the claim. The issue of the business is not stated so far as I know.

This is perhaps as good a place as any to mention the only other recorded instance in which our Ancestor found the law opposed to him. It was in 1651 that he brought suit in the Particular Court against one Henry Brown for damages in detaining two servants, Elizabeth Turner and Jeames Jupp whom a representative of Robert's mother had delivered to someone, perhaps Brown himself, with the understanding that he see them across the Atlantic and give them into her son's charge. Brown

testified "that hee had heard the said Turner and Jupp seuerall times say that they were to goe to Robert Chapman". Robert thought them too long detained by Brown and asked damages of twenty pounds; but something prevented his presence to press the claim and the Court very properly fined him two shillings and sixpence for his default, while Elizabeth and Jeames fade into the twilight of history quite possibly to become the progenitors of families highly respected today. The records of the Particular Court, so-called to distinguish it from the General Court that dealt with Colonial matters, offer revealing glimpses into the life of these early days. At one session a really criminal matter might be dealt with and at the next some decent citizen of Hartford might be fined for smoking his pipe upon the public street.

In 1663 Robert was appointed one of a Committee of Three to hear and determine the differences between the English and the Indians at Niantic where fences seem to have been burned and other causes of complaint had arisen. In 1665 he was detailed by the General Court for a similar task "respecting Vncas his complaints and to make a report to ye court what they conceiue in those matters." In the same year a fear that the famous Dutch Admiral DeRuyter might attack the colonists led to the appointment of a Committee of Safety to watch the coast, and Robert Chapman was a member of that which was to guard the stretch from 'Southerton' (Stonington?) to

Guilford. He was twice empowered to sit with the Deputy Governor and other commissioners as a court in New London in this year; and in 1666 the General Court approved the decisions arrived at and the boundaries determined between Uncas and New London. It is worth noting that this decision involved the payment to Uncas of twenty pounds by the New London people.

Such instances as this serve to show that the wholesale charges of injustices to the Indians are exaggerated. The elder Winthrop in his journal cites another case in Massachusetts which not only illustrates a disposition on the part of the authorities to do justice to the Indian but throws an interesting light on the social distinctions of the time. An Indian complained that a white man had insulted his squaw, the implication being that improper advances had been made to her. The case was tried and the man found guilty; whereupon he was sentenced to be whipped and deprived of the privilege of being called 'Mr.'

Two other instances of Robert Chapman's public services should be mentioned. In 1675 Governor Andros of New York — he did not become 'Sir Edmond' until three years later — appeared in the Connecticut with a small force and seemed desirous of asserting his authority. Indian difficulties threatened and some if not most of the younger men had left for the seat of trouble at the eastward. Robert Chapman was then an elderly man who

had repeatedly represented the Town in the General Court as Deputy or the Colony as Assistant. His appointment as Captain of the Train Band was not made until October of this year; but in July when Andros appeared he seems to have acted in that capacity; and the rest of the story may be told in his own words.

rd
Hon Sir:

Wee can doe no lesse than informe you that this morning here is arrived two sloops from New York in one of which is Governor Androes whoe hath sent Captn Nickols on shoare with two or three Gentlemen and a flagg in the head of the boate who onely haue given this account of their businesse on shoare, and if there be any neede of aide against the Indians hee hathe forces with him.

Wee are here in armes with our traine band, and the forces from the Westward were here delayed upon the intelligence of forces from N. York, and we intending here to defend ourselues and maintaine his majestys Royall grant by charter, except countermanded by yourselues. Wee can most easily perceiue that what they haue said is but a compliment, what their realities, wee haue not understood from them, but it is not difficult for us to imagine.

Wee humbly beseeche your honours that you will please to despatch away yor order or aduice, or what you please which is all from yours to command.

Dated Say-Brooke, 8th July, 1675.

Robert Chapman.

Superscribed

rd
These for the Hono Jno. Winthroppe, Esq.

^{rr}
Gov n at Hartford.
Haste, haste, post haste upon his Majestys Special Service.

I confess to some pride in that letter. It is so careful to make no reckless accusations yet so wise in its perception of the ulterior motives of the New York Governor;

so controlled in its quiet irony, moreover, and so perfectly resolute in its determination to suffer no damage to the freedom of the Colony as defined by charter, that one hears in it an echo of the determination that withstood King Charles and a monitory murmur of the tide that was to sweep away James II and establish first the Bill of Rights in the English Constitution and then the first ten Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. I do not mean that this affair at Saybrook Fort was a great event. It was but a humble little skirmish of wits rather than of arms; but it was significant of a spirit among the colonists that was to go far and effect much.

As has been indicated Saybrook seems at this time to have been bare of young men owing to the threats that were later fulfilled in the outbreak of King Philip's War; but the Rev. Mr. Buckingham saddled his horse, rode through the parish, called together such men as could bear arms and left the hay then in the fields to be harvested by the women. Our Ancestor marshalled this hastily gathered company at the Fort, closed the gates, hoisted the King's colours and sent the above letter post haste to Hartford. The authorities there were quite alive to the danger of Andros and his attempt upon what they considered their chartered rights. They had already started Captain Bull with reinforcements, and a letter of instructions followed. This ordered a continuance of the resistance to Andros, though it was to be a passive resistance

unless he forced the issue. After considerable delay and parley Andros saw the folly of using force and took his departure escorted to his boats by the colonists and honoured by a proper salute as he dropped down the river. He was by no means without good nature or humour. It was he, who, after learning Captain Bull's name told him, "that his horns should be tipped with silver"; and on a later visit to Hartford he is said to have remarked to one of the principal men — it was on a fast day and bells were ringing — "I suppose you are all praying and fasting on my account today." "Yes," was the quick reply, "this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting."

The real inwardness of this little crisis only appears when we realise that Robert Chapman and Mr. Buckingham had no instructions or actual authority to make a show of force; and some weeks later the latter wrote a rather sharp letter to the Hartford people setting forth their dilemma, together with the fact that some in Saybrook had been doubtful about taking any steps at all, and saying that but for the Providence of God and their own resolution Andros might not have found five men to resist him.*

I suspect that it was this episode that led the authorities to consider the repair of the Fort which seems to have fallen into serious dilapidation. At any rate steps in that direction were taken and Robert Chapman appointed

* NOTE. This letter appears more at large in Gates' Saybrook, p. 119.)

to oversee the work. It proved to be a considerable task. The letter announcing its completion is dated Saybrook, July the 2nd (1676) and was doubtless addressed to the Governor, though the superscription is lacking. I quote a few words.

Honnored Sir

These few lines are to signifi that the fort house together with the fortification is now finisht & that the honnord counsill would be pleased to signifi their mind as to the keeping of the same whether by the maintaining of a garison or of plasing only a family to live there if a garison to maintain watch and ward which is most honnorable and safe

t Senior'

The letter is subscribed 'Rob Chapman' with a mighty spatter of ink-spots as though the good man's pen had sputtered in signing his name. It seems to indicate too that his son Robert had now become a man of some position in the community as was indeed the case.

There is a tradition that Robert Chapman kept a journal of his early life at Saybrook but that this perished in the fire which is believed to have destroyed the Great Hall of the Fort in 1647. Mr. Gates, the historian of Saybrook, doubts whether a fire of any seriousness occurred, although Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts specifically states that the Fort was consumed. It is strange that if this were the case no more mention of it should occur in the records of Connecticut. But the tradition persists both of the fire and of the loss of our Ancestor's

the other countries in the region. The only country in the region that has not yet adopted a law is the Maldives, which is currently in the process of drafting a law.

Source: UNDP

On 12 January 2011, the Maldives' Parliament passed a bill to ban the importation of shark fins. The bill, which was introduced by the Maldives' Minister of Environment, was passed by a vote of 51 to 1. The bill prohibits the importation of shark fins into the Maldives, and it also prohibits the export of shark fins from the Maldives. The bill also prohibits the sale of shark fins within the Maldives.

On 12 January 2011, the Maldives' Parliament passed a bill to ban the importation of shark fins. The bill, which was introduced by the Maldives' Minister of Environment, was passed by a vote of 51 to 1. The bill prohibits the importation of shark fins into the Maldives, and it also prohibits the export of shark fins from the Maldives. The bill also prohibits the sale of shark fins within the Maldives.

On 12 January 2011, the Maldives' Parliament passed a bill to ban the importation of shark fins. The bill, which was introduced by the Maldives' Minister of Environment, was passed by a vote of 51 to 1. The bill prohibits the importation of shark fins into the Maldives, and it also prohibits the export of shark fins from the Maldives.

On 12 January 2011, the Maldives' Parliament passed a bill to ban the importation of shark fins. The bill, which was introduced by the Maldives' Minister of Environment, was passed by a vote of 51 to 1. The bill prohibits the importation of shark fins into the Maldives, and it also prohibits the export of shark fins from the Maldives.

On 12 January 2011, the Maldives' Parliament passed a bill to ban the importation of shark fins. The bill, which was introduced by the Maldives' Minister of Environment, was passed by a vote of 51 to 1. The bill prohibits the importation of shark fins into the Maldives, and it also prohibits the export of shark fins from the Maldives.

On 12 January 2011, the Maldives' Parliament passed a bill to ban the importation of shark fins. The bill, which was introduced by the Maldives' Minister of Environment, was passed by a vote of 51 to 1. The bill prohibits the importation of shark fins into the Maldives, and it also prohibits the export of shark fins from the Maldives.

On 12 January 2011, the Maldives' Parliament passed a bill to ban the importation of shark fins. The bill, which was introduced by the Maldives' Minister of Environment, was passed by a vote of 51 to 1. The bill prohibits the importation of shark fins into the Maldives, and it also prohibits the export of shark fins from the Maldives.

fragment of autobiography. It would be worth its weight in gold could it be recovered.

Not long before his death he wrote an address to his children. It dealt mainly with religious matters, urging them to be faithful to the Church of which he had been a staunch supporter and to which they had all been admitted as active members. This address seems to have been in possession of one branch of the Family up to comparatively recent times. The Rev. F. W. Chapman, who compiled the very valuable though faulty family genealogy, mentions this paper but states that a few years before it had been lent and never returned — a fate as lamentable as it is probable, and one that has befallen many family records both in manuscript and print.

There seems no doubt, however, that Robert Chapman was an ancestor abundantly worth having and owning for his honourable character, his long experience, his intelligence and probity, his service of the Colony as Deputy and Governor's Assistant, and of the Town as Town Clerk, Lieutenant of the Oyster River Quarter and Captain of the Train Band, together with the forty years of his probable membership in the Saybrook Church; for it can scarcely be doubted that he became a member at the time of its organisation in 1646. He died on the 13th October, 1687. His wife, Ann Bliss of Hartford whom he had married on 29th April, 1642, died 20th November, 1685.

Their children, all born in Saybrook, were:—

John,	born in July, 1644.
Robert,	in Sept., 1646.
Anna,	12 Sept., 1648. Died in infancy.
Hannah,	4 Oct., 1650.
Nathanael,	16 Feb., 1653.
Mary,	15 Apr., 1655.
Sarah,	25 Sept., 1657.

As the Tablet indicates it is the youngest son in this group of seven children who particularly interests us as our direct Ancestor and the supporter of the Saybrook residence and our family traditions. Nor was he exceptional in these particulars; for it so happens that in every generation since it has been with one exception the youngest surviving son who has watched over the declining years of his parents, administered his father's estate and inherited the Homestead. In every generation but one this son has also been the youngest by birth. That exception occurs in the generation of our Great Grandfather, Captain Elisha. He had two younger brothers; James who died as a very young man while on service in Canada in the French War; and Hezekiah, who seems to have had in high degree the pioneer instinct that has been marked in many members of the Family. After graduating at Yale in the Class of 1766 he became in succession a clergyman, a lawyer, and possibly a surveyor; for it was while engaged with a surveying party in the wilderness of Western New York that he became separated from his companions and perished either of exposure or through an

attack by wolves. When this paragraph was first written I supposed this misadventure to have occurred before the death of his Father, Caleb, in 1785, though the date of it was not known to the genealogist. But in revising this page for the printer I discovered in the Yale Catalogue of Graduates that the date was given as 1794. So Capt. Elisha was an exception to this tradition in both particulars.

There is, of course, a perfectly natural reason for this inheritance in successive generations by the youngest son. Families were generally large. The country was new. Young men were adventurous. They married in youth and looked for homesteads and modest fortunes of their own. Some found this opening near at hand; others went to new lands to the westward when 'westward' might mean no more than the outlying sections of the town or the distant lands of what is now central New York. Thus the father of the Saybrook family growing old upon his own acres leaned more and more upon his youngest son, who finally succeeded to the Homestead and to most of the lands, caring for his parents in their last years, laying them to rest, and administering their affairs.

It is a curious fact and one worth noting here that there exists in England an almost precise analogue to this practice which has a legal name. In 1913, while serving abroad with a United States Commission upon Rural Co-operation, I asked some questions of Messrs. Brown,

Shipley & Company, the Bankers with whom I have always dealt in London. A representative of the firm kindly arranged for me a meeting with some bankers in the City who would be more conversant than he with the matters in question. These gentlemen represented the great banking house of Barclay, and in talking with them of rural credit and co-operation I happened to mention our long residence in southern Connecticut and the fashion in which the youngest son in each generation had inherited the family home. Their interest was at once aroused; and so was mine when they told me that this fashion of inheritance was a recognised form in some parts of England — I think in the Eastern Counties — and had a specific name, which, alas, has escaped me.

It is a matter of great regret that the sites of Robert Chapman's grave and that of his Wife, Ann Bliss, are not known. No existing stone so far as I know bears a date so early as those of their deaths except one in memory of Susannah Lynde, the little daughter of Nathanael Lynde, who died in 1683. Matthew Griswold is said to have been buried in the northern part of the 'burying ground' of that early day and it is supposed that this section is now covered by the present road running in front of the cemetery. If this tradition be correct it seems probable that the graves of our Ancestor and his Wife were in the same section and have met the same fate. It is the more fitting therefore that this Tablet of today should

bear his name and foster his memory. The grave of each of his descendants whose name follows his upon it is known, properly marked, and reverently cared for.

In passing it may be mentioned that the eldest son, John, after living to middle age in Saybrook, moved to East Haddam where he became well known as Captain John Chapman. He received a grant from the General Court in 1694 for the establishment of a ferry across the Connecticut which long bore his name, and he owned large tracts of land in East Haddam and Hebron.

His brother, the second Robert, lived his active life in Saybrook where he became prominent in both Town and Church, representing the former in eighteen sessions of the General Court and the latter in the deliberations of the Assembly that framed the famous Saybrook Platform of 1708. This was not primarily a theological statement but rather an instrument of ecclesiastical government which influenced the life and work of the Connecticut Churches for the next century and a half. Its name entered so widely into common talk that whimsical seamen appear to have sometimes applied it to the Bar which blocked the mouth of the Connecticut River and caused untold annoyance down to our own time. This good man died while in Hartford on colonial business the 10th November, 1711. He was buried in the churchyard of the First (Centre) Church where his grave may still be seen; and the fact is doubly worth noting here because some have

perhaps supposed it to be the resting place of the original Settler who died nearly a quarter century earlier.

Now we turn to Great Great Great Grandfather Nathanael. He was the worthy son of a worthy father. But he must have led a far less adventurous life. His will may be found in the Appendix to the Chapman genealogy and is an interesting example of the minute detail to which the inventory of an estate descended in those days when tools and household utensils were far more difficult to obtain than today. First come his arms: — one small gun, his sword, a musket and its ammunition, estimated to be worth 3 pounds four shillings and eightpence. Then follow in order his books; his wearing apparel; his money (which comes to 33 pounds 15 shillings and 6pence); his beds and bedding; his table linen; his 'joiners ware' (meaning his furniture); the 'brazery ware' (kettles, metal dishes, etc.); his 'Cooper's ware' (pails, a churn, barrels, 'three small caggs,' etc.); 'Cloathers instruments' (a loom, wheels, cards, a hatchel, etc. with 36 pounds of wool); 'husbandry utensils'; 'the stock' (among which appear the 'black white faced cow, ye pide (pied) cow, ye young red cow'); the provisions, (wheat and wheat-meal, Indian corn, oats, barley, pork, seed-corn, and 'part of a side of sole-leather') showing that 'provision' is used in its larger sense; and finally the real estate. It is difficult to estimate what his holdings in land originally were because at the

time his will was made he had apparently given substantial portions to his elder sons including 1,500 acres in Hebron (probably wild land) to his son, the Rev. Daniel Chapman, M.A., of Green's Farms. This clergyman was the first of the Family to graduate from Yale. He received his degree in 1707 in the infancy of the College; and he sent his oldest son, Daniel, to graduate in turn with the Class of 1738. After these gifts Nathanael's real estate appears to have consisted of ten parcels valued in his inventory at 1,002 pounds, 14 shillings and 8pence.

This will was probated in Guilford 3 May, 1726, although Saybrook was then, I think, in New London County. I have mentioned it and its items because they throw some light on the possessions, the way of life, and the values attaching to the simplest household goods in that early time. It has often been remarked that the second and third generations of the settlers were more primitive than their fathers. The settlers came with memories based upon some experience of the Mother Country, its arts, its ways of life and general culture. Their children, born and bred in a relative wilderness, had wilderness associations in youth and memories in age. There is a modicum of truth in all this and no doubt there was a recession of culture in many cases, and in some very little culture to begin with. But among the serious-minded and more intelligent settlers I think that this danger was felt in such degree that much thought and care were given

to handing on what had been best in the old life. We have seen in this family of Nathanael how one son was sent to Yale and how his son in turn followed him. The signatures of the Settler's three sons, John, Robert and Nathanael are extant and all are firm, clear, and relatively modern — a marked improvement in legibility over the signatures of the elder Winthrop and of Gardiner, and a considerable improvement over that of their Father. I am aware that legibility of script is a poor measure of general culture; but it is evident that these men had obtained the rudiments of a sound education. Furthermore the language of such portions of his will as may be regarded as probably framed by Nathanael himself is strong and sonorous as though their author were used to thinking in clear and literate form influenced somewhat by Biblical style.

This is a reasonable assumption; for Nathanael was an officer of the Church for some forty-five years, having been chosen Deacon about 1681 and continued in office until his death in 1726. He served Town and Colony in the General Court in twenty-four sessions and left behind him at his death on the 5th April in the year just mentioned an honourable and fragrant memory. He was buried near the western border of Cypress Cemetery and about half way from the present street to the Cove. Thus, when the new portion was added and I purchased a border lot, it was possible to choose one next his resting place

and the Trustees very kindly permitted me to include enough of the adjoining tract in the old cemetery to bring the graves of Nathanael and his second wife, Hannah, into my plot of ground and to care for them. It was natural therefore that when this Memorial was erected it should be placed so as to face these two graves.

As has just been implied Nathanael was twice married: first to Mary Collins of Guilford, 29th June, 1681; second to Hannah Bates, probably of Saybrook, 26th July, 1698. She died in December, 1750. The date of the death of Mary Collins is not known. The four children by the first marriage were:—

Nathanael,	born 13 May, 1682 and died in infancy.
Nathanael 2nd,	19 July, 1686.
Daniel,	14 March, 1689.
John,	18 May, 1694.

The five children by the second marriage were:—

Mary,	born 30 August, 1700.
Hannah,	29 August, 1702.
Phineas,	10 August, 1704.
Caleb,	6 October, 1706.
Anne,	26 October, 1709.

Our story has now reached the chapter on Great, Great Grandfather Caleb. It must be a short one; for there seems little to record beyond his three marriages, the names of his children, and the bare fact of his service in the French and Indian War as a member of the Sixth Company of the Second Regiment, and his service of the Church in the office of Deacon from 1774 to his death

in 1785. The mention of this last date leads to the further question of his age. There seems to be little doubt as to the date of his birth on 6th October, 1706, since it is naturally spaced between the birth-dates of his elder brother Phineas and his younger sister, Anne. Nor have I ever known any question to be raised about the date of his death on 4th June, 1785. This would bring his age into its 79th year. Yet the large stone at the head of his grave, still in pretty good preservation though somewhat moss grown, bears the legend "AEtat. 77". I am the more inclined to think the customary dates which I have used on the Memorial Tablet to be correct in view of the fact that if he were indeed younger by two years than we have supposed it would have brought his birth into a very unusual proximity to that of his younger sister; and mistakes by the cutters of early tombstones are by no means unprecedented. The inscription reads as follows:—

Sacred to the memory of
DEA. CALEB CHAPMAN
Who died June 4th 1785
AEtat. 77
Regular in life exemplar in
Religion strict in morals and
Faithful in his office.

"And the saying pleased the whole
People and they chose STEPHEN
a Man full of faith and of
the Holy Ghost who was
appointed unto this office."

Caleb was thrice married:— On 2nd July, 1729, to

Thankful Lord who died 31st August, 1747; to Abigail Lee on 11th January, 1749; and to Mrs. Hannah Platts who died 4th May, 1794. The dates of Abigail Lee's death and of Hannah Platts' marriage I do not know. All of Caleb's eight children were the fruit of the first marriage. Their names were:—

Thankful, born	18 April, 1730.
Phineas,	13 August, 1732.
Hannah,	20 July, 1734.
Lucretia,	2 November, 1736.
Caleb,	10 November, 1740. Died at Havannah unmarried.
Elisha,	10 November, 1740.
James,	13 January, 1743. Died in the French War.
Hezekiah,	31 August, 1746. Perished in the wilderness of Western New York, 1794.

Had our Ancestors kept journals of their long and useful lives none would have been better worth having, with the possible exception of the legendary diary of the First Settler, than that which told the story of Great Grandfather Elisha. His military services were, however, of a sort to discourage writing letters to say nothing of keeping a continuous record of day-by-day doings. He was interested in the Family's past and cherished the traditions that had come down to him; and his life began so early as to afford personal memories of his Grandmother, the second wife of Nathanael, son of the first Robert. I suspect that the keen antiquarian interest of our own Grandfather, George Henry, was nourished and inspired by the tales he heard his father tell and by the traditions of earlier generations thus entrusted to him.

Captain Elisha was the younger of identical twins born on 10th November, 1740, in the new house built by his father, Caleb, and entered in the year of the twins' birth. This is the house that we knew as the 'Old House' at the south end of the Lane on the Old Road. In our day it had long been used as a home for families employed on the Farm and for a time it sheltered a small private school. It was burned 1st October, 1891. Into its structure had been wrought some portions of the first House of 1666; and Grandfather maintained, probably with truth, that on the roof-boards in the attic the original whitewash could still be seen in our childhood. I am sure that I have looked at the boards but the memory is not quite clear enough to permit a guaranty of the whitewash. This house was a large rectangular structure without the long sloping back roof that characterised so many houses of the time. The rear posts were as long as those in front, but a rear ell had been added to contain a kitchen.

Severely plain and as severely substantial it might easily have completed a second century had not fire cut it off at the age of one hundred and fifty-one. It may be worth a passing notice that Great Grandfather Elisha and our Father, Robert, were the only two of our direct line each to die in the house in which he had been born more than four score years before.

The great Seven Years War which involved so much

of Europe and America broke out in 1756 when Elisha was not quite sixteen and his younger brother James only thirteen. This was a tremendous struggle, almost as inclusive in its miseries as that which is raging as I write in the summer of 1941; and although undeclared until 1756 it had been in progress at sea during the previous year. We can scarcely realise in our later day the strain that this war put upon the English colonies. Connecticut at the beginning raised more men than any other of the New England colonies except Massachusetts and more than Massachusetts in proportion to her population; and the mortality among her troops was very heavy. It was so great indeed in the Havannah expedition of 1762 toward the close of the war that we are told only a handful of those who sailed lived to see home again; and I suspect that it was in this expedition that Elisha's twin brother Caleb lost his life. I have only the record that he died at Havannah unmarried.

If some younger person than I could take time and trouble enough to trace Great Grandfather's enlistments and calls to the colours through the public records and note the engagements in which his battalions and regiments took part we might fill some of the gaps in his military service. When he entered the army at sixteen it was of course as a private soldier. He served four campaigns in this war. In the second and third of these he was a non-commissioned officer; and in the fourth an

ensign. If these were consecutive, as I suspect they were, this would have brought him well through his twentieth year. The campaigns of 1756 and 1757 were unfortunate and the Connecticut men, who numbered more than twice the quota assigned to the Colony, had some reason to be discouraged under generals like Abercrombie as well as by the inevitable misfortunes of war, though they themselves had competent officers in Lyman and Putnam. But with the advent of British generals like Amherst and Wolfe things looked up; and by the end of 1760 Canada was subdued. Where was this Ancestor? I think he was at Ticonderoga in '58 rather than with the Connecticut troops that helped to capture Louisburg, since had he gone so far by sea as the latter expedition necessitated we should have had some record of it. We know that in '60 he was in the Colonial Line under Amherst when that excellent soldier captured Montreal and practically ended the Canadian phase of the war.

It was natural then that when the War of the Revolution broke out he should enter the service. Visiting Washington's camp before Boston he was recommended to Governor Trumbull for a commission as captain, obtained it on his way home, at once raised a full company of men and soon joined the army on Long Island. After the Battle of Long Island and the defeat of the Continental Army his company was stationed at the lower end of Manhattan Island at or near the Battery while Washing-

ton's main army withdrew to the north. This withdrawal was so rapid that he and his men were almost cut off. Finding themselves isolated and in danger of capture as the British moved up the east side of the island they quietly withdrew under cover of the high west side, succeeded in rejoining the main force, and formed a part of the Continental rear guard during the change of base to White Plains. It was during this adventure that Ebenezer Ingham, one of the forbears of the family so well known in the Saybrook of our generation, undertook to carry his captain's knapsack while the latter was keeping his file of men in line lest the retreat should prove a flight. They were under fire and a bullet struck this soldier who was a very large and powerful man, probably the best equipped of any in the company to carry a double burden. He was fortunate in doing so since the bullet hit the outer knapsack, passed through it, and lodged in the inner. Tradition says that it lodged in Ebenezer Ingham's Bible. Traditional bullets often do and I hope it was so in this case. It may have been, for the Inghams were a godly folk and I can remember hearing our Father say, when a manual of the Saybrook Church was printed in my boyhood, that the Inghams in its membership outnumbered those of any other name.

One of the burdens of Washington was laid upon him by the habit of the militia regiments of going home at the close of the season's campaign. It was a bad habit;

but it was enforced by the inability of the poorly organised Continental Congress to maintain a large army in the field and by the necessity laid upon the rank and file to see to their farms and flocks. So Great Grandfather with his men seems to have returned to Saybrook at the close of the active campaign of 1776. Here two sets of military duties awaited him during the remainder of the war. He was again commissioned as Captain of the Minute Men or Coast Guard and as such commanded his men in the field when Burgoyne was captured at Saratoga; was again summoned to help garrison the forts at New London; was called to New Haven on another occasion; and once had to resist a threatened landing in Saybrook itself. Beyond these active services I suppose it to have been a part of his duty to keep himself informed of the condition of the Sound coast and to prevent intercourse with the British Fleet which was often stationed in the protected waters of Gardiner's Bay. The needs of this fleet were, of course, considerable; there were people on the Connecticut shore who, though loyal enough in general, thought it no very heinous sin to run a boatload of sheep or other provisions across to Plum Gut on a dark night. The prevention of this illicit traffic was a part of the Coast Guard's duty; but the chance of gain joined to the love of adventure made this type of bootlegging so attractive to many natives who were expert boatmen that its

complete suppression was almost as impossible as the prevention of rum-running later proved to be.

These duties done, the veteran of two wars and many campaigns settled down to the ways of peace, still a comparatively young man of about forty. As I have implied earlier it is probable that he was a less careful husbandman than some of his fathers; and pretty certainly less than his Son and Grandson. But he was a good citizen, representing the Town in the Legislature and holding other positions of trust in 'Church and Civil State' as the Founders of Yale liked to say. They were not exalted but they help to round out the picture of "a brave soldier, an honest man, and more than all a consistent Christian," as one of his sons described him. There is a story which I have told elsewhere of his service as one of the committee to 'dignify' the pews in the parish Church; for, despite our common notions to the contrary, social position loomed a good deal larger in the public eye then than now; and the society of the later Eighteenth Century was in many respects more distinctly aristocratic than that of the Twentieth. It was a most unchristian practice to seat people in church with regard to their position in the town; but something like it was done and Great Grandfather was one of the men to do it. Of course there was heart-burning and complaint. One day a man from a distant part of the town came to see Captain Chapman and voice it. He was a prudent man however and took care to have

a substantial ditch between him and the Captain. The latter heard him and finally, after the give and take of complaint and answer had run on for some time, brought it to a close by saying, "Go home, Mr. X, go home. You have as good a seat in church as you deserve." This of course only fanned the flame and the malcontent retorted, "I'd have you know, Captain, that if we all had our deserts some of us would have a seat no nearer the House of God than the town pound . . ." The old soldier felt that something more than words was now required and advanced to restore discipline; but flight and the prudent ditch ended the incident.

The marks of the campaigner were always evident in his habits and it is said that he would never use a glass for shaving, but sat down before the fire and managed this precarious business solely by feeling, and like most men, with strange grimaces. The hardships of his youth seem only to have toughened a naturally strong constitution and he lived into his eighty-fifth year, dying in 1825 just too soon to benefit by a substantial amount of pension money that would have fallen to him a few months later. He was known as a reader of books and cherished the family traditions which were handed down through him to our Grandfather.

On 9th March, 1762, Elisha Chapman married Huldah

Lord. Their family, large even for those fruitful days, numbered 12 children, named as follows:—

Huldah,	born 1 December, 1763 (sic) 1762?
Caleb,	23 July, 1764 (sic)
Clarissa,	17 April, 1767.
Anna,	22 June, 1769.
Hannah,	2 August, 1771. Died in her sixth year.
Lucretia,	29 March, 1774.
Elisha,	3 August, 1776. Died in infancy.
Elisha 2nd,	3 December, 1777. B.A. Yale, Class of 1797.
Hannah 2nd,	3 July, 1780.
Chloe,	14 February, 1783.
Richard Lord,	21 March, 1787.
George Henry,	30 June, 1789.

We have now reached a point when the older of us must remember the families which were born to several of these children, although our Grandfather is the only one who survived to make our acquaintance. I therefore pause to make a comment or two about them.

Huldah the eldest married Jonathan Bishop of Guilford and was the mother of two children the elder of whom died in infancy. The younger, Jonathan like his father, made his home in Guilford and became the head of a family well known there and in New Haven.

Clarissa, the third child and second daughter, married Timothy Bartlett of Guilford. It is interesting to note that her marriage took place in the same year as and two or three months before the birth of her youngest brother who became our Grandfather; and her first child was but about a year his junior. Of her five children the second,

Horace Bartlett, went to central New York and settled in Paris not far from Utica. A daughter of his married a Mr. Head and their home in Utica, where both our Mother and later I myself were guests, was a memorable example of the high type of culture that our older American stock sometimes developed and perpetuated. People of means who knew enough to regard material possessions as means and not as ends, serious-minded yet with a cheerfulness that not only abounded in humour but bubbled with fun, they were a family to be long and gratefully remembered by all who knew them intimately. I went to them once for a day's stay on my way to Buffalo in 1888 when somewhat out of health. My welcome was such that the visit was repeated on my return and an acquaintance began which ripened into one of the most rewarding of life's friendships as my letter files remind me whenever they are reviewed. Our generation has also had considerable acquaintance with another branch of the family which made its home in New Haven.

Anna, the fourth child and third daughter, married Stephen Chalker on 16th March, 1786. Of their six children, the second, named like his father Stephen, made his home in the vicinity of the Mill and became the father of the Robert Chalker family. Their children, Anna (Mrs. Richard Bushnell), Robert and Benjamin we have all known and esteemed.

It was this daughter, Anna, who retained and handed

on a vivid memory of LaFayette's call at Great Grand-father's house during the Revolution when he passed through Saybrook on his way to Newport. It was, I suspect, a quite unpremeditated call caused by the need of the company of horsemen for water. But Great Grand-mother was equal to the emergency. She welcomed her distinguished visitor and with her older daughters provided refreshment for him and his suite.

Anna was sent upstairs to shepherd the younger children; but with the curiosity of a girl of nine she peered out and gained a lifelong memory of the striking young Frenchman who himself lacked a month of one and twenty. Indeed the story goes that in 1825 she came again to her Father's house to see if in the old man of nearly seventy she could still discern the youth of twenty. But on this visit LaFayette passed in the night and she did not see him. Like most traditions the story creaks a little in its joints. It is probable that in 1825 she, then a widow, was caring for her Father in her childhood's home according to an agreement which will presently appear, as he did not die until the autumn of this year. Furthermore by this date the so-called 'new road' from Oyster River to Lord's Corner was in use and it is highly improbable that LaFayette took the old detour instead of the direct route. So that she would naturally have to come to Grand-father's new house. It is the least of items, but worth

mention if only to caution us against too great trust in the detail of family stories.

Some question has been raised as to the date of this incident. It must have been on the 2nd of August, 1778, I think, or possibly a day or two earlier. LaFayette was on his way to take command of a considerable detachment of troops sent to reinforce Sullivan in Rhode Island and he was to meet d'Estaing in command of the French fleet. He reached Providence on the 4th and, eager traveller though he was, could scarcely have done so on the day following the Saybrook episode; though a few weeks later he is reputed to have ridden seventy miles in seven hours. On the Saybrook occasion he had been for a considerable time on the road and it is doubtful if he had fresh horses.

One wonders who, if any, of his aides was with him at the Old House. He had started from Washington's Headquarters with four French gentlemen. Of these Major de Gimat was destined to remain the friend and coadjutor of many years; M. Gouvion, who in the French Revolution commanded the Palace troops on the night of the Royal Family's tragic attempt to escape, had his life snuffed out a little after that by an Austrian cannon ball; M. Nevill was the third; and the fourth was an Auvergnat ~~nois~~ gentleman, Count Moré de Pontgibaud. Both these latter aides were with LaFayette at the surrender of Cornwallis; and both the former were later decorated by the Society of the Cincinnati. It would be interesting to think

that all four partook of Great Grandmother's hospitality. But it is unlikely; for with boyish impatience their chief was eagerly writing letters to d'Estaing on the journey and detailing a responsible officer to ride ahead with them. Let us hope that the last stayed with him and added to the impressiveness of the occasion, possibly sitting in one of the several chairs that are reputed to have held the Marquis. French counts have been notoriously plentiful; but where a marquis is lacking the continental equivalent of an earl is doubtless better than nothing.

Lucretia, the next daughter of Elisha and Huldah Chapman to survive childhood, married Samuel Sanford on 20th August, 1797. Their eldest son, Edward, born in 1798 and his wife, Ursula Whittlesey, are still remembered by the older of us in their home at the Head of the Street and next to the large 'old Sanford house'; and their daughters, 'Miss Ellen' and 'Miss Frances' survived until recent years. The son, Edward, went west and became a lawyer. One of his daughters used to visit her aunts and took some part in our social activities when I was a young man.

The third son of Samuel and Lucretia Chapman Sanford was Henry, who married Mary Clark. I do not know how many children they had; but there was one daughter, Maria L., born in Saybrook 19 December, 1836, who attained to considerable eminence as a college teacher. She was Professor of History in Swarthmore College and later

Professor of Rhetoric and Elocution in the University of Minnesota. Her success in this latter position made her one of the best known women of the Northwest, widely acclaimed during her life and after her death, when, I think, an important university building was named in her memory. I remember her and the esteem in which she was held by our Parents whom she used to visit from time to time; but my absence from home during the later visits kept me from any intimacy of acquaintance, and this I regret as she must have been a woman of unusual attainment and ability.

Hannah, the fifth child of our Great Grandparents, died in her sixth year, but Hannah II, ninth in the group, married Henry Skinner and went west with him. I wish that I could speak more confidently about this family for I think them to have been closely associated with the settlement of Milwaukee. Our Grandfather used to tell of a brother or brother-in-law who was an inveterate pioneer and I dimly remember the story of a temporary settlement in western New York where he owned land that later became the site of a very large town, and later still 'cutting the first tree on the site of Milwaukee'; and I am well persuaded that the reference was to Henry Skinner. Of their children there is a record of one who became a farmer in Wisconsin, another an artisan and another a teacher in Milwaukee; but further than this I cannot speak except at the instance of a dim and boyish

memory; so that what is said above must be read as nothing more than a somewhat probable legend.

Next to Hannah II came Chloe. She married Captain William Clark, made her home with him in Saybrook, and bore eight children, four of whom I remember, three of them vividly. These were the eldest son, Samuel, whom I saw a few times in childhood when he visited his brother and sisters. But the fourth child, 'Mr. William J.' was a familiar and respected figure; kindly, too, and most considerate of me when I came to be examined by him when he was a member and probably chairman of the School Board and I was a candidate for a school. He prefaced the business by saying that he thought it scarcely necessary to examine a young man fresh from his books — my name was then on the matriculation list of Yale though I had not yet entered college — but that he would ask me a few questions. Among these was a test in spelling. He asked me to spell 'receive'. I spelled it. "Now", said he with well-remembered consideration, "we will take one of a different sort. You may spell 'believe'." Under these happy auspices I passed. 'Mr. William J.'s' children, Mrs. Booth and 'Mr. William Edwin' with their families are remembered by the youngest of us.

There remain in this group 'Mr. William J.'s' two younger sisters, Fanny and Chloe Amelia. The former became Mrs. Sumner Bull, the latter the well remembered librarian of the Acton Library. It is significant that in our

Family the former was always 'Cousin Fanny', the latter 'Miss Amelia'. This suggested, though it was not meant to emphasise, the greater personal charm of the older sister to whom the word 'pleasant' was exactly applicable; but I should be sorry to have it cast any reflection upon the younger who occupied so considerable a place in the life of the reading portion of the community. She used to smile upon Frank Chalker and me when on our walks down town on library evenings we dropped in to see her whether we were looking for books or not; and as she grew older and became a bit subject to arthritis one of us used to wind her eight-day clock for her. It was not an absolutely settled custom but it was a frequent and welcome attention which I think Frank kept up after I had gone to college; and looking back it still forms a small but happy memory.

Richard Lord Chapman, next to the youngest child of Captain Elisha, lived in the house which we have known as the home of Mr. Erastus Clarke. He built it and died in it at the comparatively early age of 52 while his wife, Hope Pratt, died three years later aged 53. I mention them here for two reasons. Their eldest son, Richard Elisha, grew into a man of excellent moral character but was so singularly lacking in practical gifts that he became an object of constant and sometimes anxious care to our branch of the Family during the greater part of his mature life. Grandfather rescued enough of his small patrimony

to build the little house under Beacon Hill which we have all known as 'Elisha's'. The good man would never have spent his few dollars in riotous living but it would have been won away from him by designing persons. The land on which this house stood belonged to us and the house therefore could not be sold. Moreover he paid a nominal rent for the land and therefore did not become its owner by mere possession. This rent, was, I think, a dollar a year; but no money passed between tenant and landlord. The rent was duly charged on Grandfather's and Father's books. When autumn came and cattle were kept upon the Hill certain fodder was carted to his garden which he was instructed to throw over the boundary fence in fit quantities during the few days of early cool weather before the cattle were taken home; and this service was duly credited against the charge. Though not a profitable workman he was employed at such tasks as suited his capacity and thus during the year earned an appreciable sum which was constantly helped out from the family farm.

Elisha married a woman perhaps as well adapted to his circumstances as could have been expected though I think it neither an exaggeration nor an injustice to say that she lacked charm. She took care of him pretty faithfully and governed his mild nature without undue severity. Her one extravagance seemed to be snuff in the abundance of which he shared though with less visible results; and

I look back with satisfaction also upon his one cigar a year smoked on the Fourth of July, though the satisfaction is tinged with regret that I did not personally solace his later days with more. People smiled at him and his mannerisms; but he was no mere figure of fun. He was an amiable, honest, devout man, worthy of genuine respect but sadly unequal to the business of a practical livelihood.

My other reason for lingering over this family is that a word must be said about Richard Lord Chapman's wife and Elisha's mother, Hope Pratt. She was a very large woman and there is a story for which I cannot vouch that her eldest and most impractical son once undertook to carry her across a wide puddle; but fearing she might slip he set her down in the middle to 'get a better hold'. The good woman seemed a little jealous of Grandmother's happier lot in life, and one cannot wonder as she contrasted her own widowed state and narrow means with Grandfather's relative prosperity; and I think it a tribute to Grandfather's seemingly irascible but fundamentally patient nature that when he came home from Boston as he did several times a year bringing Grandmother perhaps a piece of silver or a shawl he took pains that it was balanced by a less but still appreciable gift to good 'Aunt Hopey'.

I ought to add that one of the sons of this family became an artist of some attainment and I well remember his English wife and their visit to our home in my boy-

hood. Their son in turn became an artist and his imaginative illustration of aerial warfare in the old St. Nicholas still comes back to me. Its prophecy seemed as amusingly fantastic then as its fulfillment seems wickedly fantastic now.

This is perhaps as good a place as any to mention another instance of the landlordism of Grandfather. His long absences from home before the days of railways left Grandmother too much alone. So it was arranged that a Miss Martha Clark, known by courtesy as 'Aunt Mattie', should take up her residence in a little house just to the west of the Homestead and across the lane or driveway leading to the farm buildings. It was quite too near to make it advisable for a permanent neighbour; so this good woman paid a rent for the house or for the land on which it stood. I am not sure whether Grandfather built the house for her or whether it was her own standing upon his land. This rent was the smallest available silver coin, I think a sixpence. At a certain date Aunt Mattie produced her sixpence. In Grandfather's absence Grandmother gave a receipt for it, and duly returned the coin. Aunt Mattie wrapped it up and it was laid aside until the next rent day, a record being duly made of the transaction. I can still remember that little house, long after Aunt Mattie's day, going off across the fields to form the home of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Macer who considerably enlarged it.

It has become so much the fashion to deride country life for its crudity, hardness and indifference to the lot of less advantaged folk that we need to be reminded of the sense of family responsibility and neighbourly good will that lightened many a hard lot and sustained many friendly ties.

My story enters its later phase with a glimpse of Grandfather and Grandmother. Both were of marked and memorable individuality. Both greatly endeared themselves to me, Grandmother in quite exceptional degree; and I count it to have been a piece of notable good fortune to have been brought up in such intimate association with old people of unusual vigour of both mind and body. It made old age seem pleasant rather than grievous and I have looked forward to it with a sort of kindly anticipation though quite aware that it may bring disappointment both mental and physical. But those years of my own youth and their age have always inclined me to the society of old and experienced people.

Our Grandfather, George Henry Chapman, was born on the 30th June, 1789, the year of the French Revolution. It may be worth noting incidentally that he and his next elder brother, Richard Lord Chapman, were the first of our long line to bear a 'middle name'. His life of eighty-eight years covered a very memorable chapter in world history. He heard in boyhood first hand accounts of the French and Indian and Revolutionary Wars. While still

a very young man he was summoned to military duty in the War of 1812 when the British burned the shipping in Essex which was then a part of Saybrook. He was finishing the house in which our Father and all our own big family were born in the year when Waterloo finally broke the power of Napoleon and the Hurricane of 1815 set a model for the 'Line Storm' that was not duplicated until, after one hundred and twenty-three years, the Gale of 1938 showed us what the Homestead had to bear in its infancy. I should like to think it to be a family trait that caused the old house to meet the challenge almost as well as the young house did.

His business survived, though with difficulty, the terrible financial panic of 1837 — a period of depression quite as severe in its attendant suffering, I believe, as anything that the crash of 1929 brought with it, though of course less people were affected because there were less people to affect. Those of you who have looked into the pictures of that period will not soon forget artisans of the carpenter class standing barefoot in a New York street, their tools beside them, waiting to be hired. He lived through the long struggle over slavery, sympathising as he believed constructively with efforts to mitigate and perhaps eradicate its evil, but never aligning himself with the extreme abolitionists. I can remember the African Repository which used to come to him regularly. The magazine meant little to me then beyond rousing my wonder

as to what an African repository might be. It was, of course, the organ of the Colonisation Society whose purpose was to remove to Liberia such negroes as were available and to settle them there. The appearance of this paper was a sign of his standing as an Old Line Whig. He didn't like slavery; he didn't want to see it spread; he would take some measures against it; but I wonder if he ever thought anything could come from the hopeless colonisation scheme. I rather doubt if he did; but in a troubled time when he could not join in the orgies of abolitionist denunciation he yet felt something must be tried and may have solaced himself with this makeshift. His last Whig vote was for Bell and Everett though our Father had already become an outspoken Republican and anti-slavery man. But this vote was his last as a conservative of that type and as soon as the storm of war broke he steadily and heartily supported President Lincoln and the Union Cause.

As the youngest of his father's twelve children he must have faced a somewhat bleak prospect since the old soldier, Captain Elisha, was never a perfect farmer and the older brothers and sister as they went away may well have depleted in some natural degree the small family fortune; while none so far as I know ever reached such affluence as to return any considerable support to their parents during Grandfather's young manhood. He was, however, a resolute and resourceful as well as adventurous

man. Beginning with a small sum gained by teaching he acquired a little stock of goods and began to trade. Always a man of interesting address he seems to have won his way rapidly. In the course of all this he travelled through the South and West as those words were then used though I have not been able to determine how far in either direction. I remember to have heard of an uncomfortable night spent in a Baltimore inn in quite too close proximity to a crazy person whose outcries murdered sleep; and I recall a miniature hair trunk little more than a foot long in which I suppose he carried samples. It was this that once excited unpleasant suspicion because of its weight. Some one who tested it thought it might contain gold. In fact it held English or German knitting needles of which at times he imported considerable quantities. At what time this commercial travelling ceased I am unable to state and shall always regret that I did not ask more questions in my youth.

A tentative list of dates may be given here which I believe to be approximately correct. He probably started teaching before he was twenty-one and very likely continued it until about that time. Then came his small business ventures which found him still at home during a part of the War of 1812. He was married in 1814 and had got on far enough to begin building a substantial house. It was a good house then as it is a good house now, comfortable and practicable; and the fact that it

had brown-stone foundations and steps leads me to think that he was able by this time to plan for something beyond the bare necessities of shelter. It was while these steps to the front door were being dressed that a mason named Dolph was called away from his work to man a boat putting out from the Point to attempt the capture (or recapture) of a craft in the hands of the British. A shot fired from the vessel killed Dolph. A shot returned from the boat killed the killer; and then the craft was carried by boarding. A measure of caution must be used in receiving these accounts of by-gone events that stirred many hearts and gave rise to many rumors. But this is the story heard in my youth and it must be substantially correct. I am sure of Grandfather's opinion that the man who took up Dolph's task of dressing his steps was a less skilful workman and that a line could long be discerned between the work of the two men to mark its tragic interruption. I can also remember a son of this man Dolph who in my boyhood was the sole charge in the town poorhouse. He was a harmless incompetent and it is possible that his birth was overshadowed by his father's death.

In 1818 Great Grandfather Elisha made his will apportioning his estate among his three sons and six daughters in such a way as to give equal portions to the sons and to the daughters, but providing that each daughter's portion should be two-thirds the share of each son.

I suspect that some gifts had been made to the sons and perhaps to the daughters previous to the making of this will and these were to be taken into account by the executors. Richard Lord's portion of his father's lands was to be set off so far as practicable on the north side of the new highway and Grandfather's on the south. This would cause them to correspond roughly to the lands we knew in childhood as the Clarke and Gates farms on the north and our own from our Homestead to the sea.

This 'new road' from Oyster River to Lord's Corner was opened about 1806. Richard Lord Chapman's house, now Miss Amelia Clarke's, was built in 1811; and the barn which originally stood close to the road and antedated the house a little, was said to be the first building on this new road. Miss Clarke tells me that this was the story told to her father by Elisha Chapman, son of Richard Lord. The 'Uncle Richard' house, as it used to be called, as well as our Homestead were therefore occupied by their respective families by the time the above will was made.

Another family document dating from 1818 is worth a passing mention. Great Grandfather Elisha was now a widower and in this year he executed an instrument by which his widowed daughter, Mrs. Stephen Chalker, was engaged to live with and care for him during the remainder of his life. This agreement was witnessed by Grandfather and Grandmother, George and Lucia Chap-

man, and was, I believe, faithfully kept until Great Grand-father's death in the autumn of 1825.

There is evidence that by 1823 Grandfather was in control of much and perhaps most of the land that lies toward the sea and comprised the bulk of our Father's arable fields. In July of that year his cousin, Judge Asa Chapman, to whom I have before referred, visited Saybrook. He had been born and spent his boyhood there. The Rev. F. W. Hotchkiss had prepared him for Yale where he graduated with honours in the Class of 1792. He became a Judge of the Superior Court, and then of the Court of Errors in 1818, and filled this highly honourable office until his death in 1825. This visit, made on his way between court sessions in Middletown and in Tolland County, was his first in about forty years and he was deeply impressed by it. Grandfather's success in the improvement of the family fields seems to have made the deepest impression of all and the good Judge, who owns to a romantic temperament, rises to dithyrambic heights of eloquence in praise of it. Such enthusiasm is, I fear, in reality an unconscious testimony to the generally low condition of Saybrook farming lands at that period.

It must have been about this time that Grandfather gave up most of his travels and betook himself to a Boston office and the business there that occupied him for the next score of years. The notice in the Genealogy speaks of it as a wholesale business in dry goods and fancy ar-

ticles. I cannot dispute this dogmatically; but it runs contrary to all my impressions and such evidence as the indisputable character of the later business of his sons offers. My opinion is that he was a wholesale dealer in the less bulky forms of hardware. A very large part of our cutlery — razors, pocket knives and table ware, came from England. Knitting and sewing needles were from the same source. Slate pencils, then a necessity in every school, came I think from Germany. I have myself continued to use English fishhooks when I could get them up to recent years so much neater were they for sea fishing than those supplied by the domestic trade. All these things I believe he imported, and the odds and ends of business material that he kept by him in retirement were of this nature.* Perhaps I should add that he undoubtedly dealt in and probably manufactured the wooden button moulds that were then so generally used; and he gave considerable employment to women in Saybrook and Westbrook in covering these with fabric. So I place the opening of his Boston office and the confinement to it at some year in the early Twenties and his surrender of the business to his two elder sons in the early Forties of last century. He would drive home several times a year, usually starting from Boston in mid-afternoon, making as long a day on the morrow as was good for his horse,

* NOTE. In an appendix to the Genealogy the author admits that it would have been more correct to have called this business "that of a wholesale dealer and importer."

and reaching Saybrook on the third afternoon. His driving horse was likely to be a good one; but roads were poor.

This business was successful in respect both of growth and profit so that when he passed it on to his sons he had accumulated a small but comfortable fortune. By modern standards it would appear very small; but he thought it enough to suffice him and he was never a highly acquisitive man. I have thought too that he may have been influenced toward an early retirement by the state of our Grandmother's health which about this time gave him cause for grave concern. She was in general one of the most vigorous of women and lived into her ninetieth year; but this illness necessitated a considerable visit to New Haven where she was under the care of her cousin, Dr. William Tully, then connected with the faculty of Yale. The treatment involved a free use of opium as was not infrequent in those days; and it is quite characteristic of her quick intelligence and resolute temper that as time went on she suspected that the dose was becoming dangerously welcome. The suspicion was enough and she stopped its use then and there; for the 'opium-eater' was so common a phenomenon in those days as to need no DeQuincey to make the term famous.

I have heard our Father say that Grandfather might have become a distinctly wealthy man had it not been for two things: first his generosity; and second his adven-

turous tendency to branch out into new enterprises that were not always profitable. Such was his purchase of the mill property on the boundary stream between Westbrook and Clinton five or six miles from our home. Here various forms of wood-working went on and a grist-mill ground flour and feed for a wide region. There was too a stretch of pleasant pasture beyond the stream which also belonged to him. But taking the years together the property and its balance must have gone to the debit rather than to the credit side of his books. It undoubtedly gave employment to the neighbourhood however and Grandfather was 'looked up to' in the district after a manner which his honourable character justified as I shall have occasion to illustrate presently.

His interest in new and significant improvements was very marked. I have heard that he had the first fowling-piece with nipples and percussion caps instead of the established flint-lock that came into our region; and it may well have been so. He was not himself a gunner or fisherman like his eldest son who used to come home every winter for a brief holiday among the ducks and in summer for the sea fishing, and two of whose guns rest against my library wall as I write. But he recognised the difference between the old priming that too often refused a spark or flashed in the pan and the almost certain fire of the percussion cap. Again I have heard him say something of his part in introducing the system of 'pound-

fishing' for shad into our shore communities. It became exceedingly effective — too effective indeed for the maintenance of an adequate supply of fish. He owned a stretch of fore-shore and here year after year a company operated a string of pounds paying him a certain percentage of the catch of shad. These were taken from the boats for the family table and those we did not use were accounted for in cash at the end of the season. At one time three out of every hundred went to him for the use of his land and the fish-house that stood upon it.

His paths crossed those of many interesting people whom he liked to remember. Somewhere he met a little girl whom he took upon his knee while he talked to her elders. In later years she became the celebrated actress, Charlotte Cushman, whose Shakespearian rôles were as well known in England as in America. Once a poor man known to be urgent on the track of a doubtful invention came into his office asking for a loan. I have heard Grandfather say that he could not possibly lend him ten dollars though willing to give him, as he very likely did give him, five; and the precaution was well taken because the man never had any basis for credit. Yet he was Charles Goodyear and his discovery of the vulcanisation of rubber with its enormous consequences was not very far away.

Characteristically enough, as soon as this invention reached the point when footwear was made of rubber, Grandfather owned a pair of the crude overshoes. Indeed

it was before vulcanisation had been perfected because the shoes were said to be of 'gutta percha' and were exceedingly brittle. But they pleased Grandfather and they pleased his friend, the Rev. Dr. Field, father of the famous sons one of whom laid the Atlantic cable, while another codified the laws of New York, and a third not only codified the laws of the new State of California but had his code accepted for the government of all United States Territories, and then himself passed on to become a member of the United States Supreme Court. It was a notable family and the father was by no means its least notable member. He was minister of the Church in Haddam and the historian of Middlesex County. On a visit to Grandfather he proposed one damp morning to walk to the sea. His host suggested the use of the new overshoes. Dr. Field not only approved the suggestion but philosophised upon the march of progress. "It is a wonderful dispensation of Providence," quoth he, as he thrust a foot part way into a shoe, brought it heavily down to force the foot into place — and smashed the brittle fabric into flinders. The resultant laughter of the two good men though rueful was so hearty that it has echoed through three generations of the Family.

It used to be said of President Patton of Princeton University that he had a great deal of fun with his own mind. This was true of Grandfather whose habitual absence of mind was, as is so often the case with intelligent

men, due to complete preoccupation with other things than those just at hand. He had a carriage house — 'shay-house' it used to be called — with one high bay in the middle for a vehicle with a top and two others one on either side for lower wagons. One held a 'Belchertown wagon' and the other a long open vehicle for two horses. Grandfather came home with his chaise one day, let his horse go to the stable at some distance from the carriage house, and started to put the chaise under cover by hand. But, alas, in his preoccupation with something he entered the bay with the low roof instead of the high middle section. The result was collision and some damage to the chaise-top. Greatly disgusted he sent it away for repairs; went after it himself; brought it home; and exactly repeated the first performance. I can imagine the wrath with which he realised that he had smashed his chaise-top a second time and in what seemed a perfectly imbecile manner; and I can see as clearly how he shook with laughter five minutes later; how he told Grandmother, who commented pointedly upon his lack of common sense, until she too dissolved in mirth.

My attempt to depict Grandfather's exceedingly interesting character would still lack something if I neglected to mention his habit of whimsical exaggeration. It was resorted to for the sake of emphasis and never deceived anybody. On a business journey to Providence he must have lost a somewhat responsible button. Re-

turning, he is said to have addressed Grandmother with deep feeling and somewhat as follows:— “Do you know, Mrs. Chapman, that as I was walking the streets of Providence every button fell from my trousers simultaneously”. That ‘simultaneously’ lends credence to the tale; for he loved a reverberating polysyllable as well as Dr. Johnson, and I can almost hear him rolling it out.

With it all he was a reader and accumulated a considerable though oddly assorted library. There were books of reference like Low’s many-volumed Encyclopedia, Angell’s treatise on the Law of Tidewaters and a big work on Farming. There were several historical works of some quality. That on Revolutions in Europe with a picture of Prince Poniatowski’s drowning during one of the Napoleonic campaigns impressed me deeply. So did two bound volumes of the Penny Magazine, published I think under the auspices of Lord Brougham and containing excellent woodcuts of some of Raphael’s great cartoons. One of the longer poems of Southey — the Paraguay(?) — stood cheek by jowl with Sir Walter Scott’s Tales of a Grandfather to which I owe a budding interest in history. Fielding was represented by Tom Jones and Bunyan of course by Pilgrim’s Progress which I still regard as one of the very greatest illustrations of the power and beauty of simple English prose.

All this may seem like very small beer to serve at a family feast; but I set it down for several reasons. The

current cant of the novelist when dealing with families brought up in the Puritan tradition leads him to picture their life as grim and stern when it was sincere and unctuously hypocritical when it was not. Well, this family was serious-minded in its attitude toward life's duties and obligations both to God and man. Grandfather and Father could be stern; but they abhorred cruelty. They were religious; but I never heard a word from either out of which even Mr. Sinclair Lewis in his most jaundiced moment could have extracted anything unctuous or insincere.

This leads me to set down here a rather closely held family tradition to which I never knew our Grandfather to make the slightest reference, and our Father is the only member of the Family whom I knew to be acquainted with it. As the Boston business grew and probably assumed larger proportions in the eyes of our country-side than the facts warranted, Grandfather's repute as a business man grew with it. Among those who knew him and I think were probably employed by him were two sisters living in an adjoining town who had come into possession of a tidy sum — let us say two thousand dollars, for that is as I remember it — and were at a loss to know how to bestow it until the traditional rainy day should dawn. Banks were relatively few and sometimes distrusted by rural folk, too often with reason. They asked Grandfather to take this money and make such an investment

of it for them as he deemed wise. He was very loth to do so. Sound investments were not easily come by. He was not in the investment business and did not want to enter it. But their need was as evident as their helplessness, and he finally agreed to do what he could. They would have been content had he accepted it as a loan to be used in his business; but he knew better than to permit that. It was invested as a legal trust might have been, as soundly as he knew how. All might have gone well in ordinary times. But the middle Thirties were not ordinary. Before long the crash of the later Thirties befell when public credit was shaken and private credit pretty nearly collapsed. In the general overthrow this investment was buried. It happened at a time when he like so many other business men of competence and character was able only by the utmost exertion to keep his head above the flood of ruin that prevailed. He succeeded, but only just succeeded. The loss of this fund caused him as real a grief as it caused the owners. I do not know that they blamed him in any way. What he had done was at their urgent solicitation and in no way accepted as a legal trust. Yet he could not rest under the feeling that their small fortune had passed through his hands and been lost; and at a time when the sum may well have looked almost as large to him as it did to them he made it up. Like careful Heroditus setting down the traditions of Egypt I remind you that I tell this as nearly as possible as it was told me

by our Father and may mistake an occasional detail. But the substance of the story made a very deep impression on my youth; and it accords well with Grandfather's code not only of business honour but of neighbourly kindness.

Our neighbours and dear friends, Mr. and Mrs. Rufus Denison, used in my boyhood to take paying guests in the summer; and some of these like the Lyons, the Mygatts of Amenia, N. Y., and Professor Packard of Yale were interesting and rewarding people. In his later years Grandfather responded happily to their presence, glad to do them any courtesy that he could; and I well remember their acknowledgment of this by the presentation to him of a dressing case with razors, shaving glass, etc., which filled my boyish eyes with wonder and admiration. This too was characteristic as was his active interest even to extreme old age in the progress of invention and his steady claim that, bad as the new times might sometimes seem, they were unquestionably better than the old. Something of this liberal spirit and this hope in the future our Parents inherited and under the influence of them we were brought up. It was a goodly heritage.

Grandmother was Lucia Tully, one of a large family of daughters born to Elias Tully and his two successive wives. This Tully family was of English stock though the name is commonly regarded now as Irish. One of its earliest members after reaching this country received news of some inheritance that had come to him and went to

England to claim it. His adventures were of a romantic sort for the evidence that he needed had been torn up and apparently destroyed. Daunted but not quite dismayed he traced it, discovered enough of the pieces which had been pasted to the interior of some chest or trunk I believe to substantiate his claim, obtained the property, and returned to America. It was he or another ancestor of Grandmother who published the first almanacs known in New England. They were little more than sheets; but they became famous and the recovery of one would now be worth more than its weight in gold.

A cousin of Grandmother became one of the best known physicians and teachers of *Materia Medica* in New England and was connected at different times with Yale College and the University of Vermont. And the father of this Dr. Tully achieved considerable fame by his valiant single-handed defence of a house on the shore of the North Cove against a party of marauding British or their sympathisers during the Revolution. Though a youth of less than twenty he gave the small attacking force so hot a reception with both bullet and bayonet as they forced an entrance that they withdrew and he saved the supplies which he was set to guard. I am glad to say that the tablespoons which graced his wedding a few years later still survive to serve my dinner. This family always showed marked intellectual interests side by side with rather meagre gifts for getting on in the world. I have

the diary of one of Grandmother's contemporaries, either a cousin or an uncle, who could have had few opportunities for education beyond a village school and his own efforts; but it is the story of a useful and interested life sketched in intelligent though meagre outline, and interspersed with a few short entries in Latin when some matter needed to be set down that the writer thought a little indelicate in English.

The five children of George Henry and Lucia Tully Chapman were:—

George Henry,	born 15 May, 1817.
Married Roxana Brooks.	
Harriet,	born 15 April, 1819.
Married the Rev. A. S. Chesebrough, D.D.	
Edward,	born 2 December, 1820.
Married Mary Ann Field.	
Clarissa,	born 12 January, 1824.
Married Richard P. Spencer.	
Robert,	born 8 December, 1831.
Married Maria Green Shepard.	

It would be interesting to trace the history of each each of these children and their descendants. But this is a chronicle of the Saybrook Family and neither my information nor my time permits a wide genealogical survey. The Appendix to this record has several blank leaves which are added for further individual record. Our cousins in their several degrees will find it a simple task to complete their own lines by the use of the data given above. I jot down here a few notes concerning our Uncles and Aunts.

Uncle George was a great feature in my boyhood's experience owing to his yearly visits, his appreciation of a boy's need of pocket knives and occasional small change, and particularly his love of sea fishing and his store of shooting anecdote. He took me fishing when I was far too young to go alone and I took him when he was too old; and a light went out on my horizon when he died. His only son was one of the first graduates of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and one of his grandsons has been the architect of several of the family homes in our generation.

Our Aunt Harriet lived to find an affectionate place in the memory of the youngest of us and her last years in the house which she and Dr. Chesebrough built after his retirement from the active ministry was so close to our own that each family seemed to be part of the other. Both were students of Saybrook history and careful recorders of our traditions. Their old age together was beautifully peaceful and the memory of it remains as a family benediction. Of their three children the eldest married an army officer during the Civil War and lived with him after it at various army posts, until he was forced to retire owing to partial disability dating from a wound received on the field of Antietam. Their later home in New Hartford and their big family of exceptionally clever and interesting children kept the bonds between the two households strong until finally they were further strength-

ened by the marriage of one of them to one of us. A younger daughter of the Chesebroughs, Harriet like her mother, died in young womanhood. The only son spent a part of his young manhood in Saybrook and was a frequent visitor in our home. Later he went to St. Louis, finally marrying and settling in Toledo, where his Daughter-in-law and Grand-daughter still keep in touch with the Family.

Our Grandparents' second son, Edward, with his elder brother, George, carried on the Boston business until some time after the Civil War when they retired with what seemed comfortable fortunes for those less extravagant days. His family consisted of one son who died in boyhood and five daughters whose visits to their grandparents brightened my childhood, though all were older than I except Gertrude. All are gone except Fannie, the only one who remained unmarried, and Mrs. Eastman to whom I have just referred. As an item of sad and curious interest I remind you that, when one of the great Trans-Pacific Clippers was lost in the early days of air travel across that ocean, two scientists on their way to the Philippines in government service perished with it. Both were of especial interest to us. The elder, Dr. McKinley, was an intimate friend of Dr. Frederick Gay, head of the Department of Bacteriology in Columbia University and our Brother-in-law; his associate was the husband of Gertrude Eastman's daughter.

Clarissa, the second daughter of our Grandparents, married Mr. Richard P. Spencer whose gifts of the Arabian Nights and I think also of an unabridged Robinson Crusoe that solaced and inspired my boyhood are still gratefully remembered. He was president of the Deep River National Bank from 1866 to 1909. They lived in Chester until our Aunt's death in middle life. Aunt Clarissa was so much older than our Father that she cared for him in his small boyhood and was always remembered with especial affection. It may have been after her marriage when he was left much alone that, as I have heard him say, he used to wish that there were enough in the family to fill the table in the long dining-room — a wish that, when his own family developed, was abundantly fulfilled. Aunt Clarissa had no children.

Our Parents' marriage took place in the Essex Church on the 8th October, 1861, and was solemnised by the Rev. Mr. Gallup, Pastor successively of the Congregational Churches in Essex and Madison. They had ten children, all of whom grew to maturity with the exception of one brother, perhaps the sturdiest of the lot, who met his death by accident while still a child. Indeed it is worthy of note that the family Homestead, built in 1812-15 and the birthplace of two large families, did not admit death through its doors until our Grandfather's decease in 1877 at the age of 88; and the second death was that of our Grandmother in 1882 in her ninetieth year. Few

houses steadily inhabited by successive families of many children can hope to see the passing of sixty years without a funeral.

To characterise our Grandmother and our Parents adequately would take me too far afield, and my affection for them was so deep and has proved so lasting that I should be in danger of distorting my narrative by the attempt. There is the less need because in my Modernist and His Creed I have set forth something of Grandmother's quality and of my debt to her; while in the same book and in my New England Village Life I have given large space to our Father and Mother. To repeat it all even in this very private pamphlet might seem to savor too much of family pride. It is not mere family pride, however, that has reared this simple monument to worthy though undistinguished men; but family gratitude and the memory of a truth set forth by Edward Young of the "Night Thoughts" almost exactly two centuries ago, which I venture very slightly to misquote:—

They that on worthy ancestors enlarge
Produce their debt instead of their discharge.

APPENDIX

THE DESCENDANTS OF ROBERT AND MARIA CHAPMAN

1. Edward Mortimer, born 27 September, 1862.
2. Marion Green, 11 July, 1864.
3. Annie Bliss, 31 August, 1866.
4. Kate Shepard, 28 June, 1868.
5. Harriet Chesebrough, 23 December, 1869. Died 11 May, 1898.
6. Frederick Shepard, 11 August, 1871. Died 3 February, 1941.
7. Robert Jr., 3 August, 1873.
8. George Henry, 18 September, 1876. Died 20 February, 1886.
9. Florence Maria, 3 February, 1879.
10. Howard Tully, 18 January, 1881.

Of this large family all, with the exception of George who died in childhood and Harriet who died in young womanhood, married as follows:—

Edward married: first, Isabel Northrop of Essex 28 June, 1894, who died 19 December, 1920; and second, Louise Wadsworth Jones of New Hartford, 22 December, 1923.

Marion married Charles P. Botsford, M.D., of Hartford, 13 August, 1902.

Annie married Professor George H. Haynes of Worcester, Mass. 4 November, 1903.

Kate married Albert D. Auryansen of Newton, Mass. 5 January, 1898.

Frederick married Mary S. Gardner of New London, 8 January, 1907.

Robert married Clarissa S. Hastings of Holyoke, Mass. 27 September, 1904.

Florence married Harold B. Ward of LeRoy, N. Y. 15 June, 1911.

Howard married Edith S. Pratt of Old Saybrook 4 October, 1924.

The two children of Edward and Isabel Chapman were:—

1. Edward Northrop, born 4 April, 1895.
Married Janet Galbraith Johnson of Saranac Lake, N. Y. 26 August, 1925.

Their children were:—

1. Robert Galbraith, born Colorado Springs 29 September, 1926.
2. Edward Northrop Jr., born Albany, N. Y. 27 January, 1928.
3. Richard Fiske, born Colorado Springs 18 February, 1933.

2. Lucia Tully, born 14 February, 1898.

Married in Damascus, Syria, Thomas Dudley Goord of Surrey, England, 13 February, 1934.

The two children of Albert and Kate Auryansen were:—

1. Katherine Wellington, born 15 October, 1902.
Married Samuel Armstrong Talbot, 14 August, 1937.
One child, Ann Chapman, born 27 August, 1940.
2. Winslow Chapman, born 3 February, 1906.
Married Dorothy Ramsay, 27 December, 1939.
One child, Mary Shepard, born 4 August, 1941.

The three children of Frederick and Mary Chapman were:—

1. Susan Gardner, born in Manilla, P. I. 24 May, 1908.
2. Mary Elizabeth, born in Manilla, P.I. 30 September, 1909.
Married Cedric Louis Child, 23 September, 1939.
One child, Clarence Holmes, born 1 September, 1940.
3. Marion Green, born in Old Saybrook, 14 February, 1913.

The two children of Robert and Clarissa Chapman were:—

1. Dorothy Ann, born 2 September, 1905.
2. Margaret Shepard, born 15 January, 1909.
Married Richard Burt Hodges, 2 December, 1939.

The four children of Harold and Florence Ward were:—

1. Howard Chapman, born 17 December, 1912. Died in infancy.
2. Eleanore McPherson, born 8 November, 1914.
Married Roswell Keith Doughty, 11 October, 1936.
One child, Martha Ward, born 21 January, 1941.
3. Margaret Chapman, born 18 March, 1916.
4. Florence Shepard, born 3 August, 1917.



